

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,291	12/23/2003	Paul C. Horn	20268.01	7870
7590 07/01/2005			EXAMINER	
Richard C. Litman			STOKES, CANDICE CAPRI	
LITMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD. P.O. Box 15035			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Arlington, VA 22215			3732	
			DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004	ς .

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u>.                                    </u>		wh
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/743,291	HORN, PAUL C.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Candice C. Stokes	3732
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rent. In a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty ariod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become AB.	oply be timely filed  (30) days will be considered timely.  FHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> 2b) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und	This action is non-final.  Dwance except for formal matte	• •
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the applicati 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		•
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2003  Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ the drawing(s) be held in abeyan rrection is required if the drawing(	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1 Certified copies of the priority docum  2. Certified copies of the priority docum  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But  * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE	Paper No(s 3/08) 5) Notice of In	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/23/03</u> .	6)  Other:	_·

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,689,139 in view of Tom Du Toit (USPN 5413,579). The patent claims the same patentable invention as recited in the present application with the exception being that the present invention recites a jig having a "substantially rectangular longitudinal cross-section" and further comprising "a cutting slot disposed diagonally across the jig body and extending from the top surface to the bottom

Art Unit: 3732

surface". The '579 patent to Tom Du Toit teaches in Fig. 1 a cutting guide or jig 10 with a substantially rectangular longitudinal cross-section comprising a cutting slot 18 disposed diagonally across the jig 10 and extending from the top surface to the bottom surface of the jig 10. As to Claim 2, the differences between the '139 patent and the present invention recited in claim 2 is the present recitation of "a flat portion adjacent to each of the sides on the bottom surface" whereas the '139 claims "a flat portion adjacent one of the leg on the bottom surface". It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate more than one flat portion into the invention patented in the '139 patent, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8. Regarding Claim 4, Fig. 1 of Tom Du Toit shows one hole disposed at the first end and the second hole disposed at the second end of jig 10. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Tom Du Toit into the '139 patent in order to provide a jig device more adapted to assist in making a variety of cuts depending on the area of the body.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Candice C. Stokes whose telephone number is (571) 272-4714. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/743,291

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Candice C. Stokes

PEDRO PHILOGENE

Page 4